

Invariant construction of solutions to Einstein's field equations – LRS perfect fluids I ^{*}

Mattias Marklund [†]

Department of Plasma Physics, Umeå University, S-901 87 Umeå, Sweden

Abstract. The properties of some locally rotationally symmetric (LRS) perfect fluid space-times are examined in order to demonstrate the usage of the description of geometries in terms of the Riemann tensor and a finite number of its covariant derivatives for finding solutions to Einstein's field equations. A new method is introduced, which makes it possible to choose the coordinates at any stage of the calculations. Three classes are examined, one with fluid rotation, one with spatial twist in the preferred direction and the space-time homogeneous models. It is also shown that there are no LRS space-times with dependence on one null coordinate. Using an extension of the method, we find the full metric in terms of curvature quantities for the first two classes.

PACS numbers: 04.20.-q, 04.20.Jb, 95.30.Sf, 98.80.Hw

1. Introduction

Searching for exact and approximate solutions to Einstein's field equations can be a cumbersome task, and often *ad hoc* mathematical assumptions are used to solve the obtained equations. This leads to the problem whether or not the solution is physically interesting, which need not be obvious. It is therefore convenient if one can start from physical restrictions, e.g., on a fluid say, and from that derive a solution to Einstein's field equations.

In general relativity the Riemann tensor and its covariant derivatives is essentially what one can measure, i.e., those are the physical observables. From the equivalence problem [1, 2] we know that given a metric $\mathbf{g} = \eta_{ij}\omega^i \otimes \omega^j$ in a moving frame, the set $R^{p+1} = \{R_{ijkl}, \dots, R_{ijkl;m_1\dots m_{p+1}}\}$, consisting of the Riemann tensor and a finite number of its covariant derivatives, gives a complete local description of the manifold ($p+1$ is defined as the lowest number for which the derivatives of that order are functionally

^{*} Work supported by the Swedish Natural Science Research Council

[†] E-mail address: mattias.marklund@physics.umu.se

dependent of those of lower order). This can be used for classifying metrics, roughly by comparing the different sets for different metrics [2, 3].[‡] This naturally leads to the question of whether or not it is possible to construct the local geometry (i.e. if we can find some basis and connection 1-forms satisfying Cartan's equations) of a manifold starting from some set of elements which we want to be the Riemann tensor and its covariant derivatives up to some order [4, 5, 6]. This task was pursued in Refs. [6, 7], and it was shown that one can always do this if some *integrability conditions* (parts of the commutators, Ricci identities, cyclic and Bianchi identities) are satisfied by the elements of the set.

The method has not yet been used in an extensive way for finding solutions to Einstein's field equations. Therefore, in this series of papers we will study how the method applies on *locally rotationally symmetric* (LRS) perfect fluids. This is quite a natural choice, since it has a well defined symmetry property and contains several physically interesting classes, e.g., inhomogeneous models and spherically symmetric models of astrophysical interest (to be studied in Ref. [8]). Also, it has been studied by other means, thus making a comparison between different methods possible.

In Sec. 2 we review the equivalence problem and its inverse procedure, i.e., construction of solutions of Einstein's equations.

In Sec. 3 we set up the conditions for a perfect fluid space-time to have LRS, and we generate the integrability conditions (IC) for these space-times. Here we introduce a new technique for keeping the choice of coordinate(s) undetermined through the calculations. We classify the space-times into six classes which are either disjoint, or need some special treatment. In Secs. 4-6 we investigate the IC for four of the classes.

In Secs. 7-10 we generate and solve the isometry algebra over $F(M)$ for two classes, and find the form of the metric for these.

We will use the following conventions:

- The metric has signature $(+, -, -, -)$.
- Uppercase latin indices refers to the frame bundle basis:

$$\begin{aligned} A, B, \dots &= 1, 2, \dots, k, \\ P, Q, \dots &= k + 1, k + 2, \dots, n(n + 1)/2, \end{aligned}$$

and $I, J, \dots$ are general indices.

- Lowercase latin indices denotes components with respect to the moving frame on M :

$$i, j, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

Boldface lowercase latin indices refers to the functionally independent objects in

[‡] The method has been given the name *Karlhede classification scheme* (and sometimes the Cartan-Karlhede classification scheme).

R^{p+1} :

$$\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b}, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, k.$$

- Uppercase greek indices is used for coordinates on the fibers of the frame bundle, i.e., the parameters of the orthogonal group:

$$\Upsilon, \Phi, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, n(n-1)/2.$$

- Lowercase greek indices are used for the coordinates on M :

$$\mu, \nu, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, n.$$

- $f|_i$ denotes the directional derivative $\mathbf{e}_i(f)$, where f is some function and $\mathbf{e}_i$ a tangent basis vector.

2. Method

Here we first give a short review of the equivalence problem and its solution. Suppose we are given two n -dimensional Riemannian manifolds $(M, \mathbf{g})$ and $(\tilde{M}, \tilde{\mathbf{g}})$. The two metrics are *equivalent* on some subsets $U \subset M$, $\tilde{U} \subset \tilde{M}$ if $\mathbf{g}|_U = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}|_{\tilde{U}}$. In terms of coordinates, the metrics become $\mathbf{g} = g_{\mu\nu} dx^\mu \otimes dx^\nu$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} = \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} d\tilde{x}^\mu \otimes d\tilde{x}^\nu$, and two geometries are equivalent if there exists coordinate relations $\tilde{x}^\mu = \tilde{x}^\mu(x^\nu)$, $\mu, \nu = 1, 2, \dots, n$, such that

$$\tilde{g}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\partial x^\sigma}{\partial \tilde{x}^\mu} \frac{\partial x^\tau}{\partial \tilde{x}^\nu} g_{\sigma\tau} . \quad (2.1)$$

Since it is difficult to find these coordinate transformations in general, this approach is not effective for investigating equivalence.

If one uses a *moving frame approach*, i.e., one introduces a tangent basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ and its dual $\{\boldsymbol{\omega}^i\}$, $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, (and analogously for $\tilde{M}$), so that

$$\mathbf{g} = \eta_{ij} \boldsymbol{\omega}^i \otimes \boldsymbol{\omega}^j , \quad \tilde{\mathbf{g}} = \eta_{ij} \tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^i \otimes \tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^j , \quad (2.2)$$

where (η_{ij}) is some constant, symmetric and nonsingular matrix, the equivalence problem can be put in a new guise. From (2.2) we see that $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\omega}}^i = \boldsymbol{\omega}^i$ implies $\mathbf{g} = \tilde{\mathbf{g}}$. Unfortunately the converse is not true. If G is the orthogonal group on M , we can use some representation of G to make transformations of the basis while keeping the tetrad components of the metric fixed[†], i.e., $\exists$ some $\Lambda \in G$ such that $\eta_{kl} = \Lambda_k^i \Lambda_l^j \eta_{ij}$ (we will not bother in distinguishing between G and representations of G). This freedom is captured by letting the basis 1-forms be defined over the *frame bundle* $F(M)$, i.e., they depend on both the coordinates $\{x^\mu\}$ over the manifold M and the parameters $\{\xi^\Upsilon\}$, $\Upsilon = 1, 2, \dots, n(n-1)/2$, of G . Cartan's equations of structure, which defines the

[†] Actually, there still exist the possibility of discrete transformations (spatial reflection etc.) but since these are finite in number they are rather trivial (at least in our case). We therefore suppress this freedom.

connection 1-forms ω^i_j and the curvature 2-forms $\mathbf{R}^i_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2} R^i_{jkl} \omega^k \wedge \omega^l$, on a Riemannian manifold reads

$$d\omega^i = \omega^k \wedge \omega^i_k, \quad (2.3)$$

$$d\omega^i_j = -\omega^i_k \wedge \omega^k_j + \mathbf{R}^i_j. \quad (2.4)$$

with the condition $\eta_{ik}\omega^k_j + \eta_{jk}\omega^k_i = 0$. Since our 1-forms are defined over the frame bundle, the exterior derivative is defined as $d \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} d_x + d_\xi$, which implies that the connection 1-forms consists of two parts:

$$\omega^i_j = {}^{(1)}\omega^i_j + {}^{(2)}\omega^i_j, \quad (2.5)$$

where ${}^{(1)}\omega^i_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \Gamma^i_{jk} \omega^k$ and ${}^{(2)}\omega^i_j \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a^i_{j\Upsilon} d\xi^\Upsilon$, for some Γ^i_{jk} and $a^i_{j\Upsilon}$ determined by Cartan's equations. Here Γ^i_{jk} are the Ricci rotation coefficients. Therefore, when defined over $F(M)$, the connection 1-forms are linearly independent of the basis 1-forms. They make up the missing 1-forms for the basis $\{\omega^I\}$, $I = 1, 2, \dots, n(n+1)/2$, of the cotangent space $T_*[F(M)]$, i.e., $\{\omega^I\} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{\omega^i, \omega^i_j\}$. When $dx^\mu = 0$, i.e., along a fibre in $F(M)$, the ${}^{(2)}\omega^i_j$ reduce to the generators τ^i_j of G and they fulfill $d_\xi \tau^i_j = -\tau^i_k \wedge \tau^k_j$.

Using this, one can state the equivalence problem in the following way [1, 2]: Two geometries are equivalent if and only if $\exists$ relations $\tilde{x}^\mu = \tilde{x}^\mu(x^\nu)$, $\tilde{\xi}^\Upsilon = \tilde{\xi}^\Upsilon(x^\nu, \xi^\Phi)$ such that $\tilde{\omega}^i(\tilde{x}^\mu, \tilde{\xi}^\Upsilon) = \omega^i(x^\mu, \xi^\Upsilon)$.

With the collective notation introduced above for the basis of $T_*[F(M)]$, we can write Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4) as

$$d\omega^I = \frac{1}{2} C^I_{JK} \omega^J \wedge \omega^K, \quad (2.6)$$

where C^I_{JK} essentially represents the Riemann tensor. In Refs. [1, 2] it was proved that two metrics $\mathbf{g}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$ are equivalent if and only if

$$\begin{aligned} C^I_{JK} &= \tilde{C}^I_{JK}, \\ C^I_{JK|N_1} &= \tilde{C}^I_{JK|N_1}, \\ &\vdots \\ C^I_{JK|N_1 \dots N_{p+1}} &= \tilde{C}^I_{JK|N_1 \dots N_{p+1}}, \end{aligned}$$

are compatible as coordinate relations over $F(M)$. Here $p+1$ is the lowest derivative order for which $C^I_{JK|N_1 \dots N_{p+1}}$ is functionally dependent on the derivatives of order $< p+1$. This implies that the set

$$C^{p+1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left\{ C^I_{JK}, C^I_{JK|N_1}, \dots, C^I_{JK|N_1 \dots N_{p+1}} \right\}$$

gives a complete local description of the manifold. In terms of the Riemann tensor, this set is given by $R^{p+1} = \{R_{ijkl}, R_{ijkl;m_1}, \dots, R_{ijkl;m_1 \dots m_{p+1}}\}$ [2].

Since we can achieve a local description of M in terms of R^{p+1} , it can be used for constructing solutions to Einstein's equations in an invariant way, because we know that two solutions of Einstein's equations are equivalent if a comparison between their R^{p+1} gives consistent coordinate relations. Obviously, any set of R^{p+1} elements can not generate 1-forms such that Cartan's equations are fulfilled. Some conditions have to be imposed on the set. Let $\{I^{\mathbf{a}}\}$, $\mathbf{a} = 1, 2, \dots, k \leq n(n+1)/2$, be a maximal set of functionally independent objects chosen from R^p [this means that the dimension of our isometry group is $n(n+1)/2 - k$]. As our basis we have chosen $\{\omega^I\} = \{\omega^i, \omega^j\}$, where $\{\omega^i\}$ is some moving frame. In Refs. [6, 7] it was shown that the integrability conditions for a set R^{p+1} are

$$d^2 I^{\mathbf{a}} = d(I^{\mathbf{a}}|_J \omega^J) = 0, \quad (2.7)$$

$$d^2 \omega^P = d\left(\frac{1}{2} C^P_{JK} \omega^J \wedge \omega^K\right) = 0, \quad (2.8)$$

where $P = k+1, k+2, \dots, n(n+1)/2$. When these are fulfilled, we can solve for $\{\omega^A\}$, $A = 1, 2, \dots, k$, through Cartan's equations. In Ref. [7] a procedure for finding the rest of the 1-forms, based on Ref. [9], was described. If the manifold is without symmetries, i.e., $k = n(n+1)/2$, we see that we do not need any of Eqs. (2.8). If we impose some symmetry, we reduce the number of functionally independent elements in R^{p+1} , and Eqs. (2.8) have to be added.

In practice it is often easier to work in a fixed frame than to let the components in R^{p+1} depend explicitly on the parameters ξ^Y of the orthogonal group [i.e., we choose a cross-section of $F(M)$]. Suppose that R^{p+1} only depend on x^α , $\alpha = 1, 2, \dots, l$, and rotations in the ab -planes, $\{^a_b\} = 1, \dots, m$, where $l = n - \dim(\text{orbits})$ and $m = n(n-1)/2 - \dim(\text{isotropy group})$. Equation (2.7) then correspond to [6, 7]

$$d^2 x^\alpha = d(x^\alpha|_i \omega^i) = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow [\mathbf{e}_k, \mathbf{e}_l](x^\alpha) = -(\Gamma^j_{kl} - \Gamma^j_{lk}) \mathbf{e}_j(x^\alpha), \quad (2.9)$$

$$d\tau^a_b = d(\omega^a_b - \Gamma^a_{bi} \omega^i) \Leftrightarrow R^a_{bij} = 2 \left[\mathbf{e}_i(\Gamma^a_{|b|j}) + \Gamma^a_{m[i} \Gamma^m_{|b|j]} + \Gamma^a_{bk} \Gamma^k_{[ij]} \right], \quad (2.10)$$

where $|$ means exclusion from the antisymmetrisation, and the rest of the equations that have to be satisfied are (2.8) which can be written

$$\mathbf{R}^t_j \wedge \omega^j = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow R^t_{[ijk]} = 0, \quad (2.11)$$

$$d\mathbf{R}^p_q + \mathbf{R}^p_k \wedge \omega^k_q - \omega^p_k \wedge \mathbf{R}^k_q = 0 \Leftrightarrow R^p_{q[ij;k]} = 0, \quad (2.12)$$

where $t = l+1, l+2, \dots, n$ and $\{^p_q\} = m+1, m+2, \dots, n(n-1)/2$. For general relativity, the usual 1+3 orthonormal frame approach (i.e. splitting of space-time with respect to a timelike congruence) often makes use of the field equations together with the Jacobi identity for the tangent basis. Here they are replaced by Eqs. (2.10) and (2.11) (we assume that all other symmetry properties of the Riemann tensor are fulfilled).

In Ref. [6] it was also shown that instead of using the full set R^{p+1} , one can use the reduced set $S \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \{R^i_{jkl}, \Gamma^a_{bk}, x^\alpha|_k, \eta_{ij}\}$ to describe the geometry, since R^{p+1} can be

constructed from S . Note the difference in that the set R^{p+1} is covariantly defined, while the set S is not (at least in the generic case).

From the results listed above we see that if the manifold have translational symmetries only, we do not need any of the Bianchi identities. When we add some kind of isotropy we need some of the Bianchi identities but we can reduce the number of Ricci identities needed.

Thus, to construct a geometry given a set R^{p+1} or S , we adopt the following scheme:

1. Determine the set R^{p+1} or S , with the help of the IC.
2. Determine the ω^A . Since we can write $dI^a = I^a{}_I \omega^I$, we can invert this relation for k of the 1-forms, i.e., for $\{\omega^A\}$. Since the inverse of $I^a{}_A$ are part of R^{p+1} , these functions are determined from the IC.
3. Derive the isometry group from the projected Cartan's equations.
4. Finally, determine ω^P as follows:
 - (a) Using the isometry group, solve for the 1-forms in terms of some coordinate basis. Note that we can always pose this as a boundary value problem for a set of coupled ordinary differential equations (see the constructive proof of Lie's Third Theorem in Flanders [10]). In most cases, there already exists canonical choices tabulated, e.g., in the 3-dimensional case the Bianchi classification [11] and in the 4-dimensional case the work of MacCallum [12]. Now, use one of the procedures above to make a metric ansatz $\mathbf{g}$ by extending the 1-forms found to the entire manifold.
 - (b) From this, calculate the set R^{p+1} and compare with the original set, giving consistency equations for the coefficients in the metric ansatz.

3. Integrability conditions

LRS perfect fluids have been extensively studied, because they are simple in their symmetry and contains a lot of physically interesting examples (see Refs. [13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]).

The energy-momentum tensor is given by

$$\mathbf{T} = (\mu + p)\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u} - p\mathbf{g} ,$$

where $\mathbf{u}$ is the 4-velocity of the fluid, μ the energy density, p the pressure and $\mathbf{g}$ the metric. We choose a comoving Lorentz-tetrad, i.e. we select the tangent basis $\{\mathbf{e}_i\}$ and its dual $\{\omega^i\}$, $i = 0, \dots, 3$, such that

$$\mathbf{g} = \eta_{ij}\omega^i \otimes \omega^j = (\omega^0)^2 - (\omega^1)^2 - (\omega^2)^2 - (\omega^3)^2 , \quad \omega^0 = \mathbf{u} . \quad (3.1)$$

We have the following definition of LRS [7, 14, 22]:

Definition *A space-time is said to be LRS in a neighborhood $U(p)$ of a point $p \in M$ if at every point $q \in U(p)$ there is a subgroup of the proper Lorentz group that leaves invariant the Riemann tensor and its covariant derivatives, i.e., there exists a continuous isotropy group at each point in the neighborhood $U(p)$.*

We rotate the axes so that our symmetry lies in the 23-plane, which makes our tetrad fixed up to rotations in that plane.

Assumptions: The essential coordinates on the space-time manifold M are x^0 and x^1 , where x^0 is time-like and x^1 is space-like.[†] We assume that their exterior derivative can be written[‡]

$$dx^0 = X\omega^0 + Y\omega^1, \quad (3.2)$$

$$dx^1 = x\omega^0 + y\omega^1, \quad (3.3)$$

where $X = x^0_{|0}$, $Y = x^0_{|1}$, $x = x^1_{|0}$ and $y = x^1_{|1}$. If the coordinates are independent we must have $Xy - xY \neq 0$. Since x^0 is time-like, i.e., $X^2 - Y^2 > 0$, we must have $X \neq 0$. An analogous argument gives that $y \neq 0$. From this we also see that if $X = 0$ or $y = 0$, then $Y = 0$ or $x = 0$ respectively.

In previous papers [4, 5, 6], the coordinate have been specified in advance (for example, the density). A drawback with this procedure has of course been that one has then restricted once attention to models with some special behavior (in the previous example of coordinate, we must not deal with an incompressible fluid). This drawback is eliminated by using the general structure introduced above. Also, since there often exists several choices of coordinates in a given situation, this will enable one to make the ‘canonical’ choice, i.e., the choice that gives the simplest equations.

The reduced set S contains the Riemann tensor

$$R_{0101} = E - (\mu + 3p)/6, \quad R_{0202} = R_{0303} = -E/2 - (\mu + 3p)/6,$$

$$R_{1212} = R_{1313} = E/2 - \mu/3, \quad R_{2323} = -E - \mu/3,$$

$$R_{0123} = 2R_{0213} = -2R_{0312} = H,$$

where $E = E_{11}$ and $H = H_{11}$ are components of

$$E_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} C_{ikjl} u^k u^l, \quad (3.4)$$

$$H_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \epsilon_{iklm} C^{lm}{}_{jn} u^k u^n / 2, \quad (3.5)$$

[†] These are elements of R^p , or combinations thereof.

[‡] Since the $x^\alpha_{|i}$ are curvature quantities from the set R^{p+1} , components in the $\mathbf{e}_2$ and $\mathbf{e}_3$ directions would break the LRS.

where E_{ij} and H_{ij} are the electric and magnetic parts of the Weyl tensor respectively (here ϵ_{iklm} is the totally antisymmetric tensor defined by $\epsilon_{0123} = 1$).

To be able to construct a geometry we also need the rotation-coefficients. Some of these are expressible in the kinematic quantities acceleration a_i , expansion Θ , vorticity ω_{ij} and shear σ_{ij} through

$$-\Gamma_{0ij} = \nabla_j u_i = \omega_{ij} + \sigma_{ij} - h_{ij}\Theta/3 + a_i u_j. \quad (3.6)$$

The kinematic quantities are defined as [23]

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_{ij} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_i^k h_j^l \nabla_{[l} u_{k]}, & \sigma_{ij} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h_i^k h_j^l \left(\nabla_{(l} u_{k)} + h_{kl} \Theta / 3 \right), \\ \Theta &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \nabla_i u^i, & a_i &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u^j \nabla_j u_i, \end{aligned}$$

and $h_{ij} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} u_i u_j - \eta_{ij}$ is the projection tensor. The choice of a comoving frame results in all kinematic quantities with a 0 index being zero, $a_0 = \omega_{i0} = \sigma_{i0}$, because of their orthogonality to the 4-velocity. Because of the LRS there is only one independent component of the vorticity, $\omega_{23} = -\omega_{32} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega$, and one component of the acceleration, $a_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a$. The shear will, because it is traceless, look like $(\sigma_{ij}) = \text{diag}(0, -2\sigma, \sigma, \sigma)$. The rotation coefficients are then

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{010} &= -a, & \Gamma_{011} &= 2\sigma + \Theta/3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \alpha, \\ \Gamma_{022} &= \Gamma_{033} = -\sigma + \Theta/3 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \beta, & \Gamma_{023} &= -\Gamma_{032} = -\omega, \\ \Gamma_{122} &= \Gamma_{133} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\kappa, & \Gamma_{123} &= -\Gamma_{132} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -\lambda, \end{aligned}$$

where the restriction on the Γ_{12i} and Γ_{13i} follows from the LRS requirement. We do not need Γ_{23i} since we have rotational symmetry in the 23-plane. The rotation coefficient κ corresponds to the spatial divergence of the vector field $\mathbf{e}_1$, while λ is the spatial rotation of the same vector field relative to a triad which is Fermi-transported along $\mathbf{u}$. Thus all rotation coefficients are covariantly defined because of the LRS.

We can observe that we have a 3-dimensional spatial isotropy group H_3 if and only if $E = H = \sigma = \omega = a = y = x = Y = 0$. This also means that we do not need the Γ_{12i} and Γ_{13i} , and some of the Ricci identities are redundant. On the other hand, we need further components of the Bianchi identities (these will turn out to give no more information). Spherically symmetric models must have LRS and an H_3 acting only at one point. Therefore, at that point (the ‘center’ of the model) all quantities listed above must be zero. They then evolve smoothly from the center, and the evolution is given by the IC.

With all this we are ready to let the IC take explicit form, and we give them in the Appendix. It is interesting to note that to determine the magnetic part of the Weyl tensor, H , we do not need any evolution or divergence equations. It is algebraically related to the other quantities in R^{p+1} [see Eq. (A6)]. This is because we do not need the components of the Bianchi identities where H appear differentiated (according to

the theorem given in Refs. [6, 7]). In general, space-times without any isotropy have their Weyl tensors algebraically determined in terms of the rotation coefficients, their derivatives and the coordinate gradients through the Ricci identities. This follows as a corollary of the theorem presented in Refs. [6, 7].

Although they are not needed (since they are contained in the IC), things will be greatly simplified if one uses the twice contracted Bianchi-identities:

$$\mu_{|0} = -(\mu + p)\Theta, \quad p_{|1} = (\mu + p)a. \quad (3.7)$$

These can be obtained by applying $\mathbf{e}_0$ and $\mathbf{e}_1$ on parts of the Ricci identities, and using the rest of the IC.

We can compare the curvature description of geometries used here with the 1+3 threading formalism presented in the paper by van Elst and Ellis [22], since their article resembles the first part of this one (for a general discussion of the 1+3 orthonormal frame approach, see Ref. [24]). Using their notation, they choose a vector e^i as their preferred (normalized) space-like vector field, and defines the rotation of it in the usual manner. Since the rotation has to be proportional to e^i , they have $\epsilon^{ijkl}(\nabla_j e_k)u_l = -ke^i$, for some function k . If we translate this to our notation, i.e., choosing a comoving Lorentz tetrad, and using $e^i = \delta^i_1$ (using their signature convention) we get that $k = 2\Gamma_{132} = 2\lambda$. Further, the spatial divergence of e^i , $a_{\text{vEE}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h^i_j \nabla_i e^j$ (index by the author), will satisfy $a_{\text{vEE}} = 2\kappa$. The procedure of obtaining the relevant equations differs somewhat between the 1+3 formalism and the curvature description. In the former, one generate the Ricci and Bianchi identities together with the Jacobi identities. Independence of the equations is then checked. One obtains a split in the above equations into the evolution equations and the constraint equations (which contains only spatial derivatives). From this, one checks the consistency by taking the covariant time derivative of the constraint equations and demand that this derivative vanish. In the Bianchi identities, there are equations containing the derivatives of H . Now, we can from the curvature description conclude that these equations are redundant, since (because of the LRS) these parts of the Bianchi identities are never needed. Although this is no big advantage in this case (because in the three cases below the Weyl tensor is either algebraically determined or has zero magnetic part) it points at the fact that the reduction of the number of equations is automatic.

A classification of the different LRS models can be done using the IC. One essentially uses Eqs. (A2) and (A4), together with the causal properties of the coordinates (i.e., that x^0 is time-like and x^1 is space-like).

First of all, if the rotation is nonzero we can use Eqs. (A2) and (A4) to write

$$X = Y\lambda/\omega \quad \text{and} \quad x = y\lambda/\omega \quad (3.8)$$

respectively. Inserting this into the causal restrictions on the coordinate gradients, we see that the equations splits into two cases (i) $x = y = 0$ or (ii) $X = Y = 0$ (there

is also the null coordinate case $x^2 - y^2 = X^2 - Y^2 = 0$, which we treat later). Case (i), using Eq. (3.8) to combine Eqs. (A9) and (A10), gives $\beta = -\kappa\lambda/\omega$. Inserting this into Eqs. (A15) and (A16) gives $(\mu + p)\kappa\lambda = 0$. Discarding the case $\mu + p = 0$ for the moment, we check $\kappa = 0$, and see that $\lambda = 0$, so $\lambda = 0$ always holds [if $\kappa = 0$, Eq. (A11) gives $\lambda\omega = 0$]. But this gives $X = 0$, which in turn implies $Y = 0$, i.e. no dependence on any coordinates at all. These space-time homogeneous cases is treated in Section 6. Performing an analogous manipulation for (ii) gives $x = 0$. But this does not imply $y = 0$. Thus we here have a nontrivial case. From Eq. (3.8) we get $\lambda = 0$. Inserting this into Eqs. (A9) and (A14) results in $\beta = \alpha = 0$, i.e., the fluid is shear- and expansion-free.

Second, we can have $\lambda \neq 0$. From (A2) and (A4) we have

$$Y = X\omega/\lambda \quad \text{and} \quad y = x\omega/\lambda, \quad (3.9)$$

respectively. If we insert this into the causal restrictions on the coordinate gradients, we obtain (as in the first class) two separate cases: (i) $x = y = 0$ or (ii) $X = Y = 0$. For (i), using the relation between X and Y , we can combine Eqs. (A13) and (A14) and get $\kappa = -\beta\omega/\lambda$. Making use of this, Eqs. (A15) and (A16) gives the result $(\mu + p)\beta\omega = 0$. As before, we assume $\mu + p \neq 0$ for the moment. We see that this implies that $\kappa = 0$, and multiplying Eq. (A11) with ω gives $\omega = 0$, i.e. $Y = 0$. From Eq. (A9) we obtain $a = 0$, which also can be seen from Eqs. (3.7). We can proceed in the same manner for (ii), and obtain $y = 0$. But this implies $x = 0$ (see **Assumptions**), i.e., space-time homogeneous models (see Section 6).

Third, if $\omega = 0 = \lambda$ we can have dependence on both a time-like and a space-like coordinate in general. This case have zero magnetic part of the Weyl tensor, which can be seen from Eq. (A6).

When $\mu + p = 0$, the IC implies that μ and p are constants. Therefore this is equivalent to vacuum with a cosmological constant, and we will from now on assume that $\mu + p \neq 0$.

Thus, the IC gives (when $\mu + p \neq 0$):

1. $\omega \neq 0$ (LRS class I) $\Rightarrow X = Y = x = \lambda = \sigma = \Theta = 0$, no time-like dependence.
2. $\lambda \neq 0$ (LRS class III) $\Rightarrow x = y = Y = \kappa = a = \omega = 0$, no space-like dependence.
3. $\omega = 0 = \lambda$ (LRS class II) $\Rightarrow H = 0$, generally both space-like and time-like dependence.

The classification in the parenthesis is the one given in Refs. [13, 14, 22]. Three cases which lies somewhat outside the above classification are

4. Space-time homogeneous cases.
5. Dependence on one null coordinate.

6. $\mu + p = 0$.

The fourth class contains e.g. the Gödel universe and the fifth class will be shown to be homogeneous.

In this paper we study the classes 1, 2, 4 and 5. The third class contains e.g. the spherical symmetric case, which means that there is an abundance of models in it. Therefore we treat it separately in a forthcoming paper [8].

4. Nonzero vorticity: $\omega \neq 0$

In this case, we see that many of the kinematic quantities are automatically zero. This of course means that our system of equations is heavily reduced. It in fact becomes two parts, one consisting of differential equations, and one consisting of algebraic relations. Inserting the algebraic relations into the differential ones, we get the differential equations

$$y\omega' = (2\kappa - a)\omega, \quad (4.1)$$

$$y\kappa' = (\mu + p)/2 - a\kappa - \omega^2 + \kappa^2, \quad (4.2)$$

$$ya' = -(\mu + 3p)/2 + a^2 + 2a\kappa + 2\omega^2, \quad (4.3)$$

$$yp' = a(\mu + p), \quad (4.4)$$

where $'$ denotes differentiation with respect to x^1 , and the algebraic relations (which can be seen as defining relations)

$$E = -(\mu + 3p)/3 + 2a\kappa + 2\omega^2, \quad (4.5)$$

$$H = 2(a - \kappa)\omega. \quad (4.6)$$

Equations (4.1)-(4.4) contain a set of six functions: $\{\omega, \kappa, a, y, p, \mu\}$. One of them (or a combination, if preferable) can be chosen as coordinate, which makes y algebraically determined in terms of the other functions. If we assume an equation of state the number of functions reduces to 3 (counting only those contained in the differential equations), i.e., the same as the number of equations. Thus, in the generic case, we need only solve three differential equations, and the rest of the functions are determined algebraically.

If there are some algebraic constraints (e.g. $E = 0$) we can insert this in the IC. If no equations turns out to be linearly dependent, and we assume an equation of state, we can use this to generate a second order differential equation for the equation of state, as will be seen below. All other quantities are then algebraically determined in terms of the pressure and density (and possible constants), when choosing the pressure as x^1 .

We can observe that for conformally flat space-times, the constraints on the kinematic quantities gives (when inserted into the IC) as equation of state $\mu + p = 0$.

4.1. Rigid rotation

If we have rigid rotation, i.e. $\omega' = 0$, Eq. (4.1) gives $a = 2\kappa$. This can be used to combine Eqs. (4.2) and (4.3) into an algebraic equation for κ^2 :

$$\kappa^2 = (3\mu + 5p)/20 - 2\omega^2/5, \quad (4.7)$$

which, when differentiated (assuming an equation of state), yields (i) $\kappa = 0$, or (ii) $2\mu - 12\omega^2 - 3(\mu + p)\mu_{,p} = 0$. Case (i) will be treated for general vorticity in Sec. 4.5. For case (ii), the (inverse) generic solution becomes

$$p(\mu) = 12\omega^2 - 3\mu + A|6\omega^2 - \mu|^{3/2}, \quad (4.8)$$

where A is a constant of integration. There is also the solution $\mu = 6\omega^2$. In general, we may choose $x^1 = p$, which gives $y = 2\kappa(\mu + p)$.

4.2. Space-times with constant pressure

From (4.4) we see that $a = 0$. From Eq. (4.3) we then get $\omega^2 = (\mu + 3p)/4$. Differentiating this expression for ω and using the IC, we get

$$y\mu' = 4\kappa(\mu + 3p). \quad (4.9)$$

If the energy density is constant, we get a homogeneous model (see Sec. 6).

If the energy density is non-constant, we can choose this as our spatial coordinate. From (4.9) we see that $y = 4\kappa(\mu + 3p)$. We then obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \kappa^2(\mu) &= (\mu + 3p)/2 + 2p + A(\mu + 3p)^{1/2}, \\ E(\mu) &= (\mu + 3p)/6, \quad H^2(\mu) = (\mu + 3p)^2/2 + A(\mu + 3p)^{3/2} + 2p(\mu + 3p). \end{aligned}$$

Comparing with van Elst and Ellis [22] for dust space-times, we see that it is possible to integrate the system with the above choice of coordinate, thus eliminating the procedure of solving the second order equation (67) in [22] for μ .

4.3. Vanishing electric part of the Weyl tensor

$E = 0$ is equivalent to the constraint $\omega^2 - (\mu + 3p)/6 + a\kappa = 0$. Differentiating this (and using the IC) gives a constraint on the equation of state $\mu = \mu(p)$:

$$a(\mu + p)\mu_{,p} = 3(\kappa - a)(\mu + 3p - 6a\kappa). \quad (4.10)$$

This equation can be used to replace (4.1), so that ω is determined by $E = 0$. From this we see that a constant energy density gives $a = \kappa$, thus making the space-time conformally flat. But this implies $\omega = 0$, contrary to our assumptions.

The general system one obtains is fairly complicated, since it contains 9^{th} degree polynomials in a and κ , with coefficients consisting of p , μ and its derivatives up to

third order with respect to p . It therefore seems unlikely that it is possible to find the general equation of state. A possible solution to this problem is to introduce some further constraint, that will simplify the calculations. We might insert a linear barotropic equation of state $p = (\gamma - 1)\mu$. The procedure above then gives a polynomial in $\gamma - 1$, in which all coefficients are positive, which has to vanish. Thus we can conclude that the only possible solutions have $\gamma < 1$, i.e. these are all unphysical.

4.4. Vanishing magnetic part of the Weyl tensor

Now we have to impose the condition $a = \kappa$, so that $\omega^2 + a^2 = (\mu + 2p)/3$. If we differentiate the last expression, we obtain $\mu(p) = p + \mu_0$, where μ_0 is some integration constant. With p as our coordinate, the IC can then be integrated to give

$$E(p) = (2p + \mu_0)/3, \quad \omega^2(p) = \omega_0^2(2p + \mu_0), \quad a^2(p) = -\mu_0/6 + D(2p + \mu_0).$$

This model belongs to a class described by Cahen and DeFrise in Ref. [25].

4.5. Vanishing κ

From (4.2) we have $\omega^2 = (\mu + p)/2$, which, as in the preceding cases, can be differentiated, and it will yield $\mu(p) = -3p + \mu_0$, if $a \neq 0$. Here μ_0 is an integration constant. E and H are given by Eqs. (4.5) and (4.6).

Choosing p as our coordinate, we can integrate Eq. (4.3) if we insert the equation of state and the expression for ω^2 . The result is

$$a^2(p) = p + C/(-2p + \mu_0), \tag{4.11}$$

where C is an integration constant. In Ref. [22] there remained a second order differential equation [Eq. (65)] to solve. This is eliminated by the above choice of coordinate.

5. Spatial twist in e_1 : $\lambda \neq 0$

Proceeding as in Case 1, we obtain the IC as the differential equations

$$X\dot{\beta} = \lambda^2 - (\mu + p)/2 + \beta(\alpha - \beta), \tag{5.1}$$

$$X\dot{\alpha} = -2\lambda^2 + (\mu - p)/2 - \alpha(2\beta + \alpha), \tag{5.2}$$

$$X\dot{\lambda} = \lambda(\alpha - 2\beta), \tag{5.3}$$

$$X\dot{\mu} = -(2\beta + \alpha)(\mu + p), \tag{5.4}$$

where $\dot{}$ denotes differentiation with respect to x^0 , and the algebraic relations

$$E = -2\lambda^2 + 2\mu/3 - 2\beta\alpha, \tag{5.5}$$

$$H = 2\lambda(\alpha - \beta). \tag{5.6}$$

As in Sec. 4, we can reduce this system to three differential equations for three functions in the generic case.

5.1. Constant λ

When $\dot{\lambda} = 0$, Eq. (5.3) implies $\alpha = 2\beta$. Inserting this into Eqs. (5.1) and (5.2) gives

$$\beta^2 = -2\lambda^2/5 + (3\mu + p)/20 . \quad (5.7)$$

This equation can be differentiated to give [by using the IC and assuming $p = p(\mu)$] either (i) $\beta = 0$ or (ii) $2(\mu + p)p_{,\mu} - (\mu + 3p) + 12\lambda^2 = 0$, where (i) gives a homogeneous model.

As a simple ansatz for (ii) we might try $p = A\mu + B$, which gives (a) $p = \mu + 12\lambda^2$, or (b) $p = -\mu/2 + 3\lambda^2$.

5.2. $\alpha = c\beta$, c constant

Within this class of models we have the shear-free and expansion-free cases. Inserting the ansatz into the IC gives us

$$2(2c + 1)c\beta^2 + (2\lambda^2 - p - \mu)c + 4\lambda^2 + p - \mu = 0 , \quad (5.8)$$

$$\left[8(c + 1)\lambda^2 + (p_{,\mu} - 1)(\mu + p)c + 2(\mu + p)p_{,\mu} - 4p \right] (c - 1) = 0 . \quad (5.9)$$

We see that this equation is automatically satisfied if $c = 1$, i.e., if the fluid is shear free. Finally, inserting Eq. (5.9) into Eq. (5.3) gives us, with the help of the rest of the IC, the following second order differential equation for the equation of state:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\{ (c + 2)^2(\mu + p) \left[(\mu + p)p_{,\mu\mu} + (p_{,\mu})^2 \right] \right. \\ & \quad \left. + 2(c - 3)(c + 2)(\mu + p)p_{,\mu} - 3c^2(\mu + p) + 2c(\mu - 3p) + 16p \right\} \\ & \times \left\{ (c + 2)^2(\mu + p)p_{,\mu} + 6c(\mu - p) + 4(\mu - 3p) \right\} (c - 1) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

Once again, the above equation is automatically satisfied if $c = 1$. Also, if $c = -2$ (i.e., the expansion free case), we get rid of all derivative terms in Eq. (5.10). The remaining equation to solve is (5.4). One may make the ansatz $p = (\gamma - 1)\mu$ for the equation of state. From Eq. (5.10) we then express c in terms of γ . There are three possibilities: (i) $\gamma(2 + \gamma)c^2 + 2(2\gamma^2 - 5\gamma + 6)c + 4(2 - \gamma)^2 = 0$, (ii) $c = 2(2 - \gamma)/(2 + \gamma)$, or (iii) $c = 1$.

Below we investigate some special values of c .

5.2.1. $c = 0$ Since we have divided by c at several places, we here use Eqs. (5.1)-(5.4) directly. The algebraic expression for λ , which we obtain from Eq. (5.2), is differentiated, which gives $(\mu + p)p_{,\mu} + \mu - 3p = 0$, where an equation of state is assumed. This has the solution

$$2\mu/(\mu - p) + \ln |\mu - p| = \text{constant} . \quad (5.11)$$

Choosing μ as the coordinate, we have

$$\beta^2(\mu) = e^{f(\mu)} \left(\frac{1}{4} \int^\mu \frac{\tilde{\mu} + 3p(\tilde{\mu})}{\tilde{\mu} + p(\tilde{\mu})} e^{-f(\tilde{\mu})} d\tilde{\mu} + A \right) \quad (5.12)$$

where A is a constant and $f(\mu) = \int^\mu d\tilde{\mu}/[\tilde{\mu} + p(\tilde{\mu})]$.

5.2.2. $c = 1$, shear free case Equation (5.10) now becomes automatically zero. From Eqs. (5.5) and (5.6) we find that $E = H = 0$. Thus we have an H_3 and a G_6 , which implies that we are dealing with the open FLRW models. (Note that λ is now redundant.)

Of the above the above equations, the only remaining are Eqs. (5.3) and (5.4), while

$$\beta^2 = -\lambda^2 + \mu/3. \quad (5.13)$$

Since we have no constraint on the equation of state, we choose μ as our coordinate (assuming it is non-constant). This implies, through Eq. (5.4), that $X = -3\beta(\mu + p)$. Equation (5.3) can now be integrated to yield

$$\lambda(\mu) = A \exp \left(\frac{1}{3} \int^\mu \frac{d\tilde{\mu}}{\tilde{\mu} + p(\tilde{\mu})} \right), \quad (5.14)$$

(the case $\beta = 0$ is space-time homogeneous). Here A is some constant of integration.

As an example, we can solve this equation for $p = (\gamma - 1)\mu$, which will give

$$\lambda = A\mu^{1/(3\gamma)}, \quad \Theta^2 = -9A^2\mu^{2/(3\gamma)} + 3\mu, \quad X^2 = 3\gamma\mu \left[-3A^2\mu^{2/(3\gamma)} + \mu \right].$$

Here we have used $\Theta = 3\beta$.

5.2.3. $c = -2$, expansion free case We have $\dot{\mu} = 0$, and it is then straightforward to show that this is a homogeneous model. The homogeneity of the model occurs because of our assumption of an equation of state. We might take another route by not assuming this. We then have

$$\beta^2 = -(\mu + 3p)/12, \quad (5.15)$$

$$X\dot{p} = 8\beta \left[(\mu - p)/4 - \lambda^2 \right]. \quad (5.16)$$

Equation (5.3) takes the form $X\dot{\lambda} = -4\beta\lambda$. We choose λ as our coordinate. Then we can integrate Eq. (5.16):

$$p = \mu - 2\lambda^3/5 - C\sqrt{\lambda}, \quad (5.17)$$

where C is some constant. All other quantities are then given in terms of λ :

$$E = -2\lambda^2 + 2\mu/3 - (4\mu - 6\lambda^3/5 - 3C\sqrt{\lambda})/3, \quad H^2 = 3(4\mu - 6\lambda^3/5 - 3C\sqrt{\lambda})\lambda^2.$$

5.3. Vanishing electric part of the Weyl tensor

We now have the constraint $E = 0 \Leftrightarrow \lambda^2 - \mu/3 + \beta\alpha = 0$. Differentiating $E = 0$ and using Eq. (5.3), we get two cases: (i) $\beta = \alpha$, i.e., no shear, or (ii) $5\mu - p = 18\beta\alpha$. Since case (i) has already been treated above, we concentrate on case (ii). From now on we assume $\dot{\mu} \neq 0$. Using (ii) and the IC leads to the equations

$$\alpha = \frac{2(1 - p_{,\mu})}{3 + p_{,\mu}}\beta, \quad (5.18)$$

$$\beta^2 = \frac{1}{12} \frac{(\mu + 3p)(1 - 2Q)}{2(1 + Q)Q_{,\mu} + Q(1 - 2Q)}, \quad (5.19)$$

where $Q \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - p_{,\mu})/(3 + p_{,\mu})$. But by using (5.18) in the constraint (ii) we get $\beta^2 = (5\mu - p)/(36Q)$. Thus we obtain a constraint equation for the equation of state:

$$16(5\mu - p)p_{,\mu\mu} + (3 + p_{,\mu})(p_{,\mu} - 1)(1 + 3p_{,\mu})(\mu - 5p) = 0. \quad (5.20)$$

We can solve by making an ansatz on the equation of state. We choose $p = (\gamma - 1)\mu$. Inserting this into Eq. (5.20) gives $\gamma = 6/5$, and our equation of state becomes $p = \mu/5$. From Eqs. (5.19) and (5.18) we get

$$\beta^2 = 8\mu/15, \quad \alpha^2 = 2\mu/15,$$

respectively. This solution was found by Collins and Stewart [26].

5.4. Vanishing magnetic part of the Weyl tensor

From (5.6) we get $\beta = \alpha$, which implies $H = 0$. This leads to $X\dot{\beta} = X\dot{\alpha} \Rightarrow \lambda^2 - \mu/3 + \beta^2 = 0$. But from (5.5) we see that $E = 0$, which implies that this is the shear free case. Thus these are the open FLRW models.

6. Homogeneous space-times

This class of models is determined by algebraic equations only. We find that $a = 2\beta + \alpha = 0$ from Eq. (3.7). Inserting this into the algebraic equations we deduce that $H = 0$. Also, we obtain a number of very simple relations such as $\omega\beta = \omega\kappa = \omega\lambda = \beta\kappa = \beta\lambda = \lambda\kappa = E\kappa = (3E + \mu + p)\beta = 0$, plus three equations determining the relation between the kinematic and geometric quantities. From these equations we get the solutions

1. $\kappa = \lambda = \sigma = H = 0$, and $\omega^2 = 3E/2 = \mu = p$, which is Gödel's model [27].
2. $\kappa = \lambda = \omega = H = 0$, and $3\beta^2 = 3E/2 = -\mu = -p$, so that we have the restriction of stiff matter with negative pressure and energy density.

3. $\kappa = \omega = \beta = H = E = 0$, $\mu + 3p = 0$, and $\lambda^2 = \mu/3$, which is Einstein's static model. Since this has a G_7 , the rotation coefficient λ is redundant in this description.
4. $\lambda = \omega = \beta = H = E = 0$, $\mu + 3p = 0$, and $\kappa^2 = p$. This is once more Einstein's static model. Here, the rotation coefficient κ is redundant.

6.1. Dependence on one null coordinate

We can choose x^0 as our null coordinate, so that $x = y = 0$ (since everything is symmetric w.r.t. x^0 and x^1 , it does not matter which one of them we choose). That x^0 is null means that $X = \varepsilon Y$, where $\varepsilon = \pm 1$. Next we insert this into the IC. This gives $a = -\varepsilon\alpha$ and $\omega = \varepsilon\lambda$.

By using these equations in the IC it is straightforward to show that these space-times are homogeneous, $\omega = \lambda = \beta = \alpha = E = H = \dot{\mu} = \dot{p} = 0$ and $\mu = -3p$ together with $\kappa^2 = p$, i.e., this is Einstein's static model.

7. The isometry algebra

With the method described above it is not only possible to find the dynamics of the fluid, but it is also possible to find the metric in the specific cases of interest. One uses the structure of the isometry group on the orbits in $F(M)$ to make a metric ansatz. This is an easy task in the case of three dimensional groups, since one then uses the Bianchi classification, and it also works well in the four dimensional case. From this one can calculate the reduced set S and compare with the original set and from this obtain the metric components in terms of the kinematic quantities, fluid variables and rotation coefficients.

We start out with Cartan's equations (2.3) and (2.4), and project these onto the orbits of the isometry group in $F(M)$. Working in $F(M)$ has the advantage of always giving an isometry group acting simply transitive [9]. This in turn means that the differential algebra between the basis 1-forms (Cartan's equations) generates the structure constants of the isometry group (if we choose an invariant basis $\{\mathbf{e}_I\}$), i.e., if $\{\xi_P\}$ are the Killing vectors in $F(M)$ then

$$[\xi_P, \xi_Q] = \tilde{C}^R_{PQ} \xi_R \Leftrightarrow d\omega^P| = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{C}^P_{RS} \omega^R| \wedge \omega^S|, \quad (7.1)$$

where $\omega^P|$ is the projection onto the cotangent space of the orbits in $F(M)$ and the $\tilde{C}^P_{RS}$ are defined in terms of C^I_{JK} through [6]

$$\tilde{C}^P_{RS} = C^P_{RS} + C^P_{AB} I^A_{\mathbf{c}|R} I^B_{\mathbf{b}|S} - 2C^P_{AS} I^A_{\mathbf{c}|R} I^{\mathbf{c}}_{|R}. \quad (7.2)$$

Thus the rotation coefficients and the Riemann tensor [on the orbits in $F(M)$] essentially corresponds to the structure constants of the isometry group of the space-time.

The orbits in $F(M)$ are defined as $dI^{\mathbf{a}} = 0$, or when using a fixed frame $dx^{\alpha} = 0$, $\tau^a_b = 0$. This means that some of the 1-forms will be linearly dependent on the others. In the case of LRS, and with our choice of frame, this means that, in the generic case, ω^2_3 is the connection 1-form that it linearly independent of the cotangent basis.

In the following sections we find the metrics for the first two LRS classes, and discuss their relations to the IC.

8. The isometry algebra for cases 1 and 2

The isometry algebra [Eq. (7.1)] (when $\omega \neq 0$ or $\lambda \neq 0$) can be written as

$$d\sigma^1 = \Gamma\sigma^2 \wedge \sigma^3, \quad (8.1)$$

$$d\sigma^2 = \sigma^3 \wedge \sigma^4, \quad (8.2)$$

$$d\sigma^3 = \sigma^4 \wedge \sigma^2, \quad (8.3)$$

$$d\sigma^4 = \Sigma\sigma^2 \wedge \sigma^3, \quad (8.4)$$

where $\sigma^{\mathbf{A}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \omega^{\mathbf{A}}|$, $\mathbf{A} = 2, 3$, and the definitions of the remaining quantities can be found in Table 1.

Table 1. The definitions of the quantities used in Secs. 8 and 9. Notice that the main difference between the two cases lies in the causal properties of the essential coordinate q .

Case	σ^1	σ^4	σ	σ_c	Γ	Σ	q	v
1. $\omega \neq 0$	$\omega^0 $	$\omega\omega^0 + \omega^2_3 $	ω^0	ω^1	-2ω	$E + \mu/3 - 3\omega^2 + \kappa^2$	x^1	time-like
2. $\lambda \neq 0$	$\omega^1 $	$\lambda\omega^1 + \omega^2_3 $	ω^1	ω^0	2λ	$E + \mu/3 + 3\lambda^2 - \beta^2$	x^0	space-like

We may regard Eq. (8.1) as a separate (differential) equation for σ^1 , and Eqs. (8.2)-(8.4) as the algebra we need to solve. $\omega^2_3|$ can then be found through σ^1 . When $\omega \neq 0$, we know that $\omega^1 = y^{-1}dx^1$, and when $\lambda \neq 0$ we know that $\omega^0 = X^{-1}dx^0$.

The isometry algebra can be split into three cases, according to whether $\Sigma > 0$, $= 0$ or < 0 .

8.1. $\Sigma \neq 0$

If we ‘normalize’ our 1-forms as $\tilde{\sigma}^{\mathbf{A}} = \sqrt{\Sigma}\sigma^{\mathbf{A}}$, Eqs. (8.2)-(8.4) obtain the structure of Bianchi type IX. The canonical solution is (see Ref. [11])

$$\tilde{\sigma}^2 = -\sin\zeta d\theta + \sin\theta \cos\zeta d\phi, \quad (8.5)$$

$$\tilde{\sigma}^3 = \cos\zeta d\theta + \sin\theta \sin\zeta d\phi, \quad (8.6)$$

$$\sigma^4 = \cos\theta d\phi + d\zeta, \quad (8.7)$$

where θ , ϕ , and ζ are some coordinates. The equation for σ^1 becomes $d\sigma^1 = (\Gamma/\Sigma)\tilde{\sigma}^2 \wedge \tilde{\sigma}^3$. With the result above, we can solve for σ^1 and obtain

$$\sigma^1 = (\Gamma/\Sigma) \cos \theta d\phi , \quad (8.8)$$

where we have neglected a total differential in the integration procedure. We may proceed in two ways according to the properties of Σ .

If $\Sigma > 0$, the coordinates in the solution are real valued, and we can apply it directly.

If $\Sigma < 0$, the new 1-forms introduced above take their values over the set of complex functions. Thus we need to make the transformation $\theta \rightarrow i\theta$, where the ‘new’ θ is real. This will introduce an overall i in the solutions for the 1-forms (since $\sin \theta \rightarrow i \sinh \theta$), which cancels the i in the definition of the ‘normalized’ 1-forms. Also, in the solution for σ^1 , $\cos \theta \rightarrow \cosh \theta$, due to the transformation.

8.2. $\Sigma = 0$

We can now define $\sigma^\pm \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sigma^2 \pm i\sigma^3$ and $\sigma^\times \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} -i\sigma^4$. Equations (8.2)-(8.4) then becomes

$$d\sigma^+ = \sigma^+ \wedge \sigma^\times , \quad (8.9)$$

$$d\sigma^- = -\sigma^- \wedge \sigma^\times , \quad (8.10)$$

$$d\sigma^\times = 0 . \quad (8.11)$$

This has the structure of Bianchi type VI, and has the solution

$$\sigma^+ = e^{-\xi} d\eta , \quad \sigma^- = e^\xi d\tau , \quad \sigma^\times = d\xi . \quad (8.12)$$

Since the original 1-forms takes their values over the real functions, we make the transformation $\xi = -i\zeta$, $\eta = \tau^* = \theta + i\phi$, for some real coordinates ζ , θ , and ϕ (here $*$ denotes complex conjugation). Thus we can write

$$\sigma^2 = \cos \zeta d\theta - \sin \zeta d\phi , \quad (8.13)$$

$$\sigma^3 = \sin \zeta d\theta + \cos \zeta d\phi , \quad (8.14)$$

$$\sigma^4 = d\zeta . \quad (8.15)$$

The equation for σ^1 becomes $d\sigma^1 = (i/2)\Gamma\sigma^+ \wedge \sigma^-$, which has the solution

$$\sigma^1 = \Gamma\theta d\phi . \quad (8.16)$$

9. Metrics for cases 1 and 2

We here make the ansätze for the full metric for space-times where $\omega \neq 0$ or $\lambda \neq 0$. When $\Sigma \neq 0$ the simplest guess is to take

$$\sigma = \Sigma\chi(q)\sigma^1 + \psi(q)dv , \quad (9.1)$$

$$\omega^A = \delta(q)\tilde{\sigma}^A . \quad (9.2)$$

When $\Sigma = 0$, we can make an ansatz analogous to the one above:

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma} = \chi(q)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^1 + \psi(q)dv, \quad (9.3)$$

$$\boldsymbol{\omega}^A = \delta(q)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^A. \quad (9.4)$$

(See Table 1 for the definitions of quantities introduced above.)

9.1. Metrics

Introducing the parameter ϵ , which is defined as -1 for case 1, and 1 for case 2, we can write the metric $\mathbf{g} \equiv \epsilon(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_c)^2 - {}^{(3)}\mathbf{g}$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_c$ is the ‘complement’ to $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ (see Table 1), in one common form for all the cases. The metric on surfaces $\{dq = 0\}$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{(3)}\mathbf{g} &= \epsilon(\boldsymbol{\sigma})^2 + (\boldsymbol{\omega}^2)^2 + (\boldsymbol{\omega}^3)^2 \\ &= \begin{cases} \epsilon(\psi dv + \chi\Gamma \cos\theta d\phi)^2 + \delta^2(d\theta^2 + \sin^2\theta d\phi^2), & \Sigma > 0 \\ \epsilon(\psi dv + \chi\Gamma\theta d\phi)^2 + \delta^2(d\theta^2 + d\phi^2), & \Sigma = 0 \\ \epsilon(\psi dv + \chi\Gamma \cosh\theta d\phi)^2 + \delta^2(d\theta^2 + \sinh^2\theta d\phi^2), & \Sigma < 0 \end{cases} \\ &= \epsilon \left[\psi dv + \chi\Gamma\theta^{(1-s^2)} \left(e^{\sqrt{s}\theta} + e^{-\sqrt{s}\theta} \right) d\phi \right]^2 \\ &\quad + \delta^2 \left[d\theta^2 + 4^{-s^2} \left(e^{\sqrt{s}\theta} - s^2 e^{-\sqrt{s}\theta} \right)^2 d\phi^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9.5)$$

Here we have introduced another parameter, s , which is defined as -1 when $\Sigma > 0$, 0 when $\Sigma = 0$, and 1 when $\Sigma < 0$.

9.2. Consistency equations

With consistency equations we mean a comparison between the old set S and the new set $\tilde{S}$ calculated from the metric ansatz. As an explicit example of how to do this, we will look at case 1.

Starting from our metric ansatz, we use the type of tetrad that lead to the ansatz (in this case a Lorentz-tetrad) and calculate the rotation coefficients $\tilde{\Gamma}_{bi}^a$. We then observe that $\tilde{\Gamma}_{023} = \omega\chi/\delta^2$, which then gives $\chi = -\delta^2$ by comparison. Inserting this into $\tilde{\Gamma}_{013}$ and comparing with Γ_{013} from S , we get the relation $\omega\delta^2/\psi = \text{constant}$. This constant can be absorbed by redefining our time coordinate by a simple scaling (and reflection). Doing this we obtain $\psi = \omega\delta^2$, i.e., the only function from the ansatz that remains to be determined is δ (the others are known from the IC or their relation to δ).

For case 1, the remaining equations are

$$a = -y(\omega\delta^2)' / (\omega\delta^2), \quad (9.6)$$

$$\kappa = -y\delta'/\delta, \quad (9.7)$$

$$E - (\mu + 3p)/6 = -y[(y\omega')/\omega + 2(y\delta')/\delta] - 4y^2\delta'\omega'/(\delta\omega) - 2(y\delta'/\delta)^2, \quad (9.8)$$

$$-E/2 - (\mu + 3p)/6 = -\omega^2 - y^2 \delta' \omega' / (\delta \omega) - 2(y \delta' / \delta)^2, \quad (9.9)$$

$$E/2 - \mu/3 = y(y \delta')' / \delta, \quad (9.10)$$

$$-E - \mu/3 = -3\omega^2 + s/\delta^2 + (y \delta' / \delta)^2, \quad (9.11)$$

$$H = -2y(\delta \omega)' / \delta, \quad (9.12)$$

where s was introduced in the general metric (9.5).

If one insert the expressions for a and κ into the remaining consistency equations, and then use the IC, one discovers that the only equation that is not trivially satisfied when $s \neq 0$ is Eq. (9.11). Thus this equation determines the metric when $s \neq 0$, ones the IC are solved. If $s = 0$, Eq. (9.7) determines δ . Case 2 can be treated in the same manner, and we give the function δ for the different cases in Table 2.

Table 2. The form of the function δ for the different cases. Here A is an integration constant.

Case	$\Sigma \neq 0$	$\Sigma = 0$
1. $\omega \neq 0$	$\delta^2 = s(-E - \mu/3 + 3\omega^2 - \kappa^2)^{-1} = \Sigma ^{-1} > 0$	$\delta = A \exp \left[- \int (\kappa/y) dx^1 \right]$
2. $\lambda \neq 0$	$\delta^2 = s(-E - \mu/3 + 3\lambda^2 + \beta^2)^{-1} = \Sigma ^{-1} > 0$	$\delta = A \exp \left[\int (\beta/X) dx^0 \right]$

The metric (9.5) can now be written as

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{(3)}\mathbf{g} = & \epsilon \left(\Gamma \delta^2 / 2 \right)^2 \left[dv + 2\theta^{(1-s^2)} \left(e^{\sqrt{s}\theta} + e^{-\sqrt{s}\theta} \right) d\phi \right]^2 \\ & + \delta^2 \left[d\theta^2 + 4^{-s^2} \left(e^{\sqrt{s}\theta} - s^2 e^{-\sqrt{s}\theta} \right)^2 d\phi^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (9.13)$$

where the function δ is given in Table 2. Having solved the IC, we know the metric explicitly, since all functions are determined, including δ .

10. The function Σ and its relation to the IC

Since we have three different metrics depending on the properties of the function Σ , we must, through the IC, get some restriction on the constants of integration that has been introduced when solving the IC. When $\text{sgn}(\Sigma) = \pm 1$ we will get some inequality that have to be fulfilled by the integration constants. This has to be treated separately for every solution of the IC. On the other hand, when $\Sigma = 0$, we have an algebraic constraint on the kinematic quantities. This will lead to more severe restrictions than the inequalities impose. We can therefore treat this case on its own.

10.1. Case 1, $\omega \neq 0$

Now we can write $0 = \Sigma = E + \mu/3 - 3\omega^2 + \kappa^2 = -p + 2a\kappa - \omega^2 + \kappa^2$. Taking the derivative of this and using the IC, gives us either (i) $a = 0$, or (ii) $\kappa = 0$.

Case (i) was treated in Sec. 4.2, but now there is the extra equation $\omega^2 = -p + \kappa^2$. The energy density must not be constant, since then $\omega = 0$, i.e. a contradiction to our starting assumption. If the energy density is non-constant, we choose it as coordinate. We then obtain the solution of Sec. 4.2, but because of our extra constraint $\Sigma = 0$, we find that the integration constant $A = 0$.

For (ii), we obtain $\omega^2 = -p$, so that the pressure is negative. We find that p must not be constant, because then $\omega = 0$. Thus this case is equivalent to the one treated in Sec. 4.5 with the constant of integration $\mu_0 = 0$.

10.2. Case 2, $\lambda \neq 0$

The constraint becomes $0 = \Sigma = E + \mu/3 + 3\lambda^2 - \beta^2 = \lambda^2 + \mu - \beta(\beta + 2\alpha)$. Differentiating this and using the IC gives an identity. Thus we can get rid of, say, λ (expressing it algebraically in terms of the other functions) and get a simpler set of integrability conditions. The IC may then be solved (as before) for some special cases, e.g. an expansion free fluid.

11. Concluding remarks

As a conclusion one might point on the advantages of this method compared with other methods. First, we automatically obtain a reduced set of equations (although they may contain redundant information) needed to be solved to find a solution to Einstein's equations. Second, we have a split in the equations, one set consisting of the equations mentioned above, and one set that determines the rest of the metric [the 'redundant' part connected to the symmetry of $(M, \mathbf{g})$]. We hope that these examples have shown on some of the strengths of the method presented.

Acknowledgments

The author would like to thank Michael Bradley for support and enlightening discussions, and Claes Uggla and Ulf Nilsson at Stockholm University for helpful comments. Also, during the writing of this paper, REDUCE and Jan Åmans' CLASSI [28] were valuable tools.

Appendix A. Integrability conditions

In our fixed frame formalism we get the following IC:

1. Commutator equations $x^\alpha_{|[k,|\beta|}x^\beta_{|l]} = x^\alpha_{|m}\Gamma^m_{[kl]}$, with the indices (α_{kl}) given in the bracket:

$$\binom{0}{01} \quad \dot{X}Y + X'y - \dot{Y}X - Y'x = Xa + Y\alpha, \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$\binom{0}{23} \quad 0 = X\omega - Y\lambda, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\binom{1}{01} \quad \dot{x}Y + x'y - \dot{y}X - y'x = xa + y\alpha, \quad (\text{A3})$$

$$\binom{1}{23} \quad 0 = x\omega - y\lambda, \quad (\text{A4})$$

2. Ricci identities $R^a_{bij} = 2\Gamma^a_{b[j,|\alpha|}x^\alpha_{|i]} + 2\Gamma^{am}_{[j}\Gamma_{|bm|i]} + 2\Gamma^a_{bk}\Gamma^k_{[ij]}$, with the indices $(^a_{bij})$ given in the bracket:

$$\binom{0}{101} \quad Y\dot{a} + ya' = E + a^2 - (\mu + 3p)/6 - \alpha^2 - X\dot{\alpha} - x\alpha', \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\binom{0}{123} \quad H = 2(a - \kappa)\omega + 2(\alpha - \beta)\lambda, \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$\binom{0}{202} \quad X\dot{\beta} + x\beta' = -(\mu + 3p)/6 - \beta^2 - E/2 + a\kappa + \omega^2, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\binom{0}{212} \quad Y\dot{\beta} + y\beta' = \kappa(\beta - \alpha) + \lambda\omega, \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$\binom{0}{203} \quad X\dot{\omega} + x\omega' = -a\lambda - 2\omega\beta, \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$\binom{0}{213} \quad Y\dot{\omega} + y\omega' = -H/2 + \kappa\omega + \lambda(\alpha - \beta), \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$\binom{1}{202} \quad X\dot{\kappa} + x\kappa' = (a - \kappa)\beta - \lambda\omega, \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$\binom{1}{212} \quad Y\dot{\kappa} + y\kappa' = -E/2 + \kappa^2 - \lambda^2 + \mu/3 - \beta\alpha, \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\binom{1}{203} \quad X\dot{\lambda} + x\lambda' = -(a - \kappa)\omega + H/2 - \lambda\beta, \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$\binom{1}{213} \quad Y\dot{\lambda} + y\lambda' = 2\kappa\lambda + \omega\alpha, \quad (\text{A14})$$

3. Bianchi identities $R^p_{q[ij;k]} = 0$, with $\{^p_q\} = \{^2_3\}$, and the indices $(_{ijk})$ given in the bracket:

$$_{(023)} \quad X(\dot{E} + \dot{\mu}/3) + x(E' + \mu'/3) = -(3E + \mu + p)\beta - 3H\lambda, \quad (\text{A15})$$

$$_{(123)} \quad Y(\dot{E} + \dot{\mu}/3) + y(E' + \mu'/3) = 3E\kappa - 3H\omega. \quad (\text{A16})$$

Here we have used the notation $\dot{} = \partial/\partial x^0$ and $' = \partial/\partial x^1$.

We observe that the cyclic identities $R^t_{[ijk]} = 0$ are already imposed by our choice of Riemann tensor.

References

- [1] Cartan E 1946 *Leçons sur la Geometrie des Espaces de Riemann* (Paris: Gauthier-Villars)
- [2] Karlhede A 1980 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **12** 693
- [3] Brans C H 1965 *J. Math. Phys.* **6** 94

- [4] Karlhede A and Lindström U 1983 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **15** 597
- [5] Bradley M 1986 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **3** 317
- [6] Bradley M and Karlhede A 1990 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **7** 449
- [7] Bradley M and Marklund M 1996 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13** 3021
- [8] Marklund M and Bradley M 1996 Invariant construction of solutions to Einstein's field equations – LRS perfect fluids II, in preparation
- [9] Karlhede A and MacCallum M A H 1982 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **14** 673
- [10] Flanders H 1963 *Differential Forms with Applications to the Physical Sciences* (New York: Academic)
- [11] Ryan M P and Shepley L C 1975 *Homogeneous Relativistic Cosmologies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press)
- [12] MacCallum M A H 1980 On enumerating the real four dimensional Lie algebras *Preprint* Queen Mary College
- [13] Ellis G F R 1967 *J. Math. Phys.* **8** 1171
- [14] Stewart J M and Ellis G F R 1968 *J. Math. Phys.* **9** 1072
- [15] Ellis G F R and MacCallum M A H 1969 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **12** 108
- [16] MacCallum M A H 1971 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **20** 57
- [17] Collins C B 1971 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **23** 137
- [18] Bogoyavlensky O I and Novikov S P 1975 *Trudy Sem. Petrovsk.* **1** 7 (Engl. transl. 1982 *Sel. Math. Sov.* **2** 159)
- [19] Bogoyavlensky O I 1976 *Trudy Sem. Petrovsk.* **2** 67 (Engl. transl. 1985 *Am. Math. Soc. Transl.* **125** 83)
- [20] MacCallum M A H 1980 *Festschrift for Abraham Taub*, ed F J Tipler (New York: Academic)
- [21] Kramer D, Stephani H, MacCallum M and Herlt E 1980 *Exact Solutions to Einstein's field equations* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press)
- [22] van Elst H and Ellis G F R 1996 *Class. Quantum Grav.* **13** 1099
- [23] Ehlers J 1961 Beiträge zur relativistischen Mechanik kontinuierlicher Medien *Akad. Wiss. Lit. Mainz, Abhandl. Math.-Nat. Kl.* **11** (Engl. transl. 1993 *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **25** 1225)
- [24] van Elst H and Ugla C 1996 General relativistic 1+3 orthonormal frame approach *Preprint*
- [25] Cahen M and Defrise L 1968 *Commun. Math. Phys.* **11** 56
- [26] Collins C B and Stewart J M 1971 *Mon. Not. R. Astron. Soc.* **153** 419
- [27] Gödel K 1949 *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **21** 447
- [28] Åman J E 1982 Manual for CLASSI – Classification Program for Geometries in General Relativity, University of Stockholm